



**MINUTES
OF THE
OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE ADVISORY GROUP
(OHVAG)
OF
ARIZONA STATE PARKS
Meeting of October 17, 2011
Arizona State Parks
1300 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona**

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Savino called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. A quorum was not established until 9:14 a.m. when David Moore joined the meeting.

OHVAG Members Present: John Savino, Chair
 David Moore, Vice Chair (9:14AM)
 Hank Rogers
 Pete Pfeifer

OHVAG Members Absent: Donald French
 Thomas McArthur
 Bill Nash

Arizona State Parks Staff Present: Jay Ziemann, Asst. Director, ASP
 Doris Pulsifer, Chief of Resources &
 Public Programs
 Robert Baldwin, Grants Coordinator

ACTION ITEMS

1. The OHVAG will discuss and analyze a Matrix of Advisory Committees' Roles and Responsibilities along with a Decision Flowchart model for Evaluating Agencies, Boards, Commissions, which has been adopted by the Governor's Commission of Privatization and Efficiency (COPE), in order to self-apply the COPE



adopted criteria/flowchart to the OHVAG and forward their analysis to the Arizona State Parks Board.

Jay Ziemann provided background as to the purpose of the meeting and why OHVAG is discussing this particular topic and flowchart.

Mr. Ziemann explained that this issue originates back in 2010 when Governor Brewer signed Executive Order 2010-10 that created the Arizona Commission of Privatization and Efficiency (COPE). In the initial report issued by COPE, State Parks was very prominently noted, and in that report COPE recommended that virtually the entire State Parks system be privatized and turned over to the private sector. State Parks noted to the Governor's Office some of the legal problems with that initial report. When COPE released their final report in June 2011, State Parks was conspicuously absent from the recommendation. The recommendation, which dealt with privatizing State Parks, disappeared. The one area of the final report where Parks was at least peripherally affected was Recommendation #4 – Elimination, Merger, Efficiency Review or Privatization of Agencies, Boards or Commissions.

COPE then did an analysis of seventy-five state agencies and made recommendations on whether they should be merged, privatized or otherwise. The results were put into a "Table 5", however, "Table 5" was never published. Nobody seems to know where "Table 5" is at, and nobody seems to be willing to share those results.

At the June 2011 Parks Board meeting, the Board suggested that in light of our new circumstances with much of our agency's funding gone, especially with the Arizona Park Heritage Fund monies being excised from the statute, the Board might want to take a look at all of its ten advisory committees to determine if there are any redundancies or whether all of these groups need to continue to meet. What they did not want to have happen is for the Board to make decisions without any input from the advisory groups or to do this in secret.

(Dave Moore joined the meeting at this point and was recognized by Chair Savino who announced that a quorum was established – 9:14 a.m.).

Mr. Ziemann continued to explained that essentially the Board has asked staff to meet with all of the advisory groups and run them through the Decision Flowchart that was adopted by the Governor's COPE. He added

that the original flowchart and recommendations comes from the state of Virginia and was adopted by COPE to evaluate agencies, boards and commissions. He pointed out that some of the questions do not exactly apply to Arizona, but that for the most part they are “yes” and “no” questions. He continued that OHVAG is the sixth committee that staff has had this meeting with, and that essentially, the group will go through and answer the questions and staff will document the responses and note any comments. Then all of the information from all of the advisory groups will be compiled and shared with the Parks Board at their meeting scheduled for November 30th at the Apache Junction City Council Chambers. Mr. Ziemann suggested to them that they might want to have a member of OHVAG attend the November Board meeting to answer any questions before the Board.

At this point, Chair Savino asked Mr. Ziemann to lead the discussion with the questions on the flowchart.

Mr. Ziemann explained that only a general consensus was needed for each question and that there was no need for the group to take votes.

Mr. Ziemann began by reading the first question and answer on the flowchart:

1. Why was OHVAG established? (Purpose)
 - Established in Statute in 1991, statute repealed. Established by Board Action 1996.
 - Advises Board on OHV issues,
 - Recommends grants from motorized funds
 - Serves as motorized committee for federal RTP purposes.

In response to Chair Savino’s request, Mr. Ziemann polled each member on each of the following questions:

1a. Does the “Purpose” still exist?

Chair Savino - responded that “yes”, because without OHVAG the state would have no direct contact with the OHV community that is responsible for putting in millions of dollars into the system.

Mr. Pfeifer – began by referring back to the first question “why was OHVAG established?” He echoed Chair Savino’s comment that OHVAG acts as a conduit between the Parks Board and the OHV community. Following with his response to question 1a. Mr. Pfeifer stated that because

of the establishment of the Sticker Fund Program, the purpose of OHVAG still exists.

Mr. Rogers – responded “yes”, and also suggested that the OHVAG at its next meeting should review the question “does the purpose of OHVAG still exist?” along with the OHV statute to see if there any changes that should be made.

Mr. Moore – echoed Mr. Pfeifer’s comments and added that OHVAG also is responsible for the review of grant applications for OHV money.

2. Can the OHVAG demonstrate effectiveness?

Mr. Pfeifer – responded “yes”, and pointed out that was how the Sticker Fund Program came to be.

Mr. Rogers – agreed with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Moore – responded “yes”, and followed by saying that he felt OHVAG has been very cohesive in coming up with solid recommendations to the Parks Board.

Chair Savino – responded “yes”, but only if OHVAG is allowed to have a respective voice.

3. Is the State’s involvement critical?

In response to Mr. Rogers’ question, Mr. Ziemann interpreted the question as, “Is state government essential in equitably distributing the OHV monies?”

Mr. Rogers - responded that he felt it was better left up to the users with some guidance. He followed with if the State Parks Board is not happy with it, then they (OHVAG and the Board) need to sit down and talk about it. He stated that he did not know what the answer was to that question.

Mr. Moore – agreed with Mr. Rogers, although he feels that OHVAG can’t be effective without some degree of input from the Parks Board. He added that he too like Mr. Rogers was “splintered” on this question.

Chair Savino – responded “yes”. He stated that a program of the size of OHVAG needs structured administration.

Mr. Pfeifer – agreed with Chair Savino and followed up that some structure is needed in order for an OHV program to meet its goals.

3a. Is the OHVAG duplicative? Mr. Ziemann clarified, “is there somewhere else in the state where monies are being distributed in this way or making these recommendations?”

Mr. Moore – responded “no”, although to some small degree Game and Fish distributes money, but the bulk of the money is at least being distributed through State Parks.

Chair Savino – responded “no”. He followed that there is no other program out there at the present time that fits into what OHVAG does.

Mr. Pfeifer – responded “no”.

Mr. Rogers - responded “yes”, and followed that there is some duplication with Arizona Game & Fish (Az G&F) from the education standpoint. He suggested that it might be helpful to combine the two. He added that (Az G&F) receives several hundred thousand dollars a year from their portion of the gas tax for education.

Chair Savino stated he had not thought about that and agreed with Mr. Rogers. He added that Az G&F also receives about \$1.2 million dollars per year from the Sticker Fund Program.

Mr. Rogers clarified that it was put in legislation for the Az G&F to receive the Sticker Fund Program money to use specifically to handle the law enforcement part of the program. Since State Parks does not do law enforcement (for OHV), there is only duplication from the education standpoint. He stated that it could be a good thing, because it could result in better outreach, although he was not sure if it was effective.

Mr. Pfeifer asked if they were talking about a duplicate process in the program or a duplicative advisory group?

Mr. Ziemann clarified that the question is asking if there is a duplicative advisory group. In other words, “is there someone else doing what OHVAG does?”

Mr. Pfeifer asked if Az G&F has an advisory group.

Mr. Rogers responded that they do not, however they receive about \$600,000 a year of OHV money and use it to further educate the public on OHV issues.

Mr. Ziemann referred back to one of the purposes listed under item 1a. that of which is OHVAG's role of providing the public with some input into the priorities and the nature of how the OHV monies are distributed. He stated that he did not believe there was any other group that has the ability to do that.

Mr. Rogers asked if State Parks receives an accounting from Az G&F for their use of the gas tax money.

Chair Savino responded that he did not feel OHVAG has the authority to ask Az G&F for that information.

In response, Mr. Ziemann stated that Az G&F is required, as is State Parks, to report annually to the legislature and it is public information. He also suggested that OHVAG could simply ask the Board, and staff would then follow up with the request for an annual report.

3b. Does the OHVAG meet regularly?

The members all concurred that they meet regularly and accomplish a lot of business.

4. Does OHVAG reflect the priorities of the Parks Board?

Mr. Pfeifer responded that he has never talked to anyone on the Board and therefore did not know the answer to that question.

Mr. Rogers responded "yes" he believes that OHVAG does reflect the priorities of the Board most of the time, because the Board approves most of the items that OHVAG recommends to them, and outside a few issues, the Board has been very cooperative with OHVAG. He added that it is actually a good thing in that he would not want the Board to rubber-stamp everything.

Mr. Moore responded "yes" he believes that for the most part OHVAG does reflect the priorities of the Board. Although, he has not seen a list of the Board's priorities and OHVAG has not provided the Board with a list of what they need.

Chair Savino commented that he felt torn on this question, but that his response was “no”. The reason being that OHVAG reflects a target group of which a susceptible revenue source is applicable. The Board’s primary function is to address policy change issues in the state parks system. He added that statement came directly from the chairman of the Board. Mr. Savino further stated that he felt the group was going in the right direction with the Board. However, he said that when he went to the Board meeting last June in Tucson, which was held in conjunction with a State Parks convention, he noticed that none of the brochures or displays mentions or featured anything regarding the OHV community. He also stated that even in the Phoenix office, there are only two places that display pamphlets that feature any OHV items such as OHV rules.

Mr. Rogers stated that Chair Savino made an excellent point in that in the Phoenix office there is not one single picture on the wall that reflects OHV recreation. He requested to withdraw his response from “yes” and change it to “no”.

Chair Savino pointed out, however, that one of the problems with voting “no” on this question is that it points to “Elimination” on the chart. He does not want to see the program go away. Therefore, he stated he voted “yes” on this question, with a comment that OHVAG needs to strive towards ensuring that OHV is reflected in the priorities of the Board.

Mr. Ziemann summarized the consensus of the group to be that the OHVAG feels that OHV is not prominently expressed as a priority by the Board, but the group believes that progress is being made and will continue to strive towards that.

Mr. Rogers commented that the Chairman of the Board has helped to bring that forward in the last year. Hopefully, they can continue to work together to improve the relationship between OHVAG and the Board and help them understand the importance of motorized recreation. He added that as that happens he hopes to see it more reflective in the pictures and literature and on the website.

Mr. Pfeifer commented that with a better line of communication OHVAG could certainly better understand and reflect the priorities of the Board. As it stands, they do not know what those priorities are.

Mr. Ziemann reminded the group that probably the most significant way that the Board hears about the priorities of the OHVAG and the public is while the Statewide Trails Plan is in process and ultimately adopted.

Chair Savino responded that in regards to the trails plan, the plan is made up by State Parks staff with OHVAG's input, rather than by OHVAG with State Parks input.

Mr. Rogers commented that he was not trying to be critical of the Board. He was just trying to point out that there is work to be done between the Board and OHVAG, and staff and OHVAG.

5. Can the OHVAG be efficiently and effectively filled? Mr. Ziemann interpreted that question to mean, can we find public members to serve, and is there adequate staff resources to hold meetings?

Mr. Rogers responded "yes" it can be staffed. He added that he would like to see more staff help for Bob Baldwin. He stated that legislatively, a lot of money is put into the program to provide that for State Parks and therefore, he would like to see staffing restored to the level it was in the past.

Mr. Moore responded that he believed that the OHVAG could be effectively filled. He added that there are a few "hang ups" at the present time, and the process needs to be significantly streamlined.

Chair Savino stated that he echoed what the last two members stated.

Mr. Pfeifer stated that he agreed the OHVAG could be filled but that the process could be improved. He felt that with some changes there could be a bigger pool of candidates to choose from.

6. Does the OHVAG reflect or mirror the Board?

Mr. Moore responded that it does not do either one, nor should it. He stated that the OHVAG is asked to do a specific job, which in his opinion is: a) represent the public and; b) help decide how to spend the specific money. The Parks Board is not exactly trying to do that. His response to the question is "no".

Chair Savino stated that the Board needs to recognize OHVAG's decisions and referred to recent actions of the Board whereby they ignored OHVAG's decisions and went with staff's recommendations.

Mr. Pfeifer stated that he agreed with “no”, but felt that with a better line of communication and more dialog OHVAG and the Board can come together a lot better.

Mr. Rogers also responded “no”. He suggested finding a way to put a user on the Arizona State Parks Board to help them understand the motorized recreation and the people that OHVAG represents.

7. Does the OHVAG provide effective advice to the Parks Board?

Chair Savino responded “yes”, but only if allowed direct contact to the Board when OHVAG’s recommendations differs from staff recommendations. He further commented that OHVAG’s recommendations are often ignored. He agreed with Mr. Rogers that it would be helpful to have a user on the Board to open up a line of communication. He went on to say the decisions made by OHVAG are based on what the OHV community reflects to the OHVAG, and if there was a better line of communication between staff and OHVAG that would also help staff to understand where OHVAG is coming from.

Mr. Pfeifer responded “yes”, and commented that OHVAG provides the best advice they can to the State Parks Board. The effectiveness of it is solely on the shoulders of the State Parks Board.

Mr. Rogers responded “yes”, and suggested that in the future where staff and OHVAG differ on recommendations that go to the Board, differences need to be very clear and defined to the Board.

Mr. Moore agreed with the other members’ responses to this question, but he did not know if the advice from OHVAG is being used to its fullest.

Mr. Ziemann announced that was the end of the questions and asked the group if they had any other comments or questions.

In response, Mr. Rogers said “thank you”, and stated that he thought it was good to have some of these discussions. He followed that some of the questions are great questions, and should be considered further at the next couple of OHVAG meetings. He added that the questions helped him to reflect on his role and how good, or not good he is doing.

Mr. Ziemann stated that the Board is going to also run themselves through this same exercise in their meeting in October. He asked the group to carefully review the minutes from this meeting to be sure their comments



and consensus is accurately reflected. He explained that staff is not going to make a recommendation to the Board on any of the advisory groups. Staff will only be sharing the consensus of the groups with the Board in November.

Mr. Savino asked the group to be sure to check the suggested dates for a future meeting that was sent out by Doris Pulsifer.

Mr. Savino commented that OHVAG is the only advisory group to the Parks Board that inputs this great amount of money and actually helps to support the operation of State Parks. He suggested that perhaps OHVAG is in the wrong place or is labeled wrong as an advisory group. He felt that OHVAG is more than just an advisory group and suggested that perhaps that should be reviewed.

C. CALL TO THE PUBLIC: There were no responses to the call to the public.

**D. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF OHVAG
PROCEDURE REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE EVENTS:**

E. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION by Mr. Rogers, **SECOND** by Mr. Pfeifer to adjourn the meeting.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting was declared adjourned by Chair Savino at 9:50 A.M.

Respectfully submitted by:

Doris Pulsifer, Chief of Resources & Public Programs